Trans-Lake Washington Project

Washington State Department of Transportation **Sound Transit**

Summary of Open House Public Comments, January 2002

Questions on the open house comment forms:

1. **How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?**
2. **If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?**
3. **Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?**
4. **Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?**
5. **What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?**
6. **Additional Comments**

Open house at 4-8 p.m., January 15, 2002 located at the North Bellevue Senior Center, Bellevue

#	Comments
1a	1. 1 GP each direction, HOV, HCT. 2. HOV – not BRT. 3. Absolutely in SR 520. 4. Yes, yes. 5. – 6. –

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

2a	1. At first blush, I would opt for the least invasive – 4 or 6. 2. Not enough knowledge to answer. 3. Would like to hear pros and cons discussed. 4. Not qualified to answer. 5. See above. 6. This is for those already "in the know." For the general public, who is not involved in your committees, this type of presentation is impressive but does not help me understand the issues. Please offer a community forum where the various aspects could be discussed regarding the pros/cons. It seems as if those in attendance are here to simply argue for his or her own little corner of the world. We all need to understand the bigger picture and to inform people like me of the basics and the big picture, so I can have an educated opinion.
3a	1. Only 4 lanes. 2. No. 3. Only in the I-90 corridor. 4. – 5. – 6. I don't think we should expand 520. I do think we should up the number of park and rides and bus service.
4a	1. The current problem is funneling of 6-lane SR 520 into a 4-lane bridge. To avoid this, the bridge should be 6 lanes. The shoulder spaces are a waste of money. Only a small percentage of the time will a disabled vehicle slow traffic. The bike lane will also be under-utilized. 2. No, too much compartmentalization of traffic flow makes access more difficult and expensive. 3. No, no. 4. Yes, yes. Cost is a major issue and who pays. 5. The lids should be used for parking for park and rides, with access to central flyer ports. 6. (1) The WSDOT has focused mostly on [vehicle] capacity rather than public transport capacity. The latter requires reasonable public transport pricing and a good park & ride. A lot more could be done with the money if the focus is on public transport. (2) Unless capacity is increased at the I-405 and I-5 interchange, the cross-lake commute time will not be impacted significantly. A comprehensive plan will be needed that appeals to reason.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

5a	1. 2 GP and 2 HOV. 2. Yes. 3. No fixed guideway for SR 520; study for I-90. 4. Yes to TDM, yes to congestion pricing. 5. No. 6. No project without GP lanes!!! It will never get the money from the voters without GP lanes.
6a	1. The 4 and 6 lanes. NOT EIGHT LANES. 2. Yes. 3. For the future. 4. Yes – in fact, TDM with the "do nothing" option should be considered. 5. Longer, unless noise can be managed in another way. 6. Reference new bridge over Montlake Cut. The Schooner Zodiac (127' long) mast height 100' + electronics makes 6-8 passages a year through the cut taking our groups from its base at the Metro Docks near Gas Works Park.
7a	1. 4 lanes! 2. Don't evaluate a HOV lane! 3. No. 4. Yes – but only to the extent that constraints on population growth are considered! 5. Only consider sound suppression walls along the entire corridor. 6. The fundamental flaw in this project is that it is based on too aggressive (high) population-growth projections from the State OFM. The project should be restructured to consider alternatives under zero, and significantly reduce population growth projections from OFM.
8a	1. Evaluate both 6 and 8 lanes with HOV lanes. 2. HOV lanes should NOT include Bus Rapid Transit. I-90 LRT can absorb transit growth well into the future. 3. LRT (HCT) should stay on I-90. It will serve Bellevue better than an SR 520 alignment. HCT in the SR 520 corridor might not be necessary, since LRT can absorb transit growth for a long time. 4. TDM should be evaluated. Regional Road Pricing (tolls) must be evaluated and must be included in the final EIS. 5. Any highway lids can be evaluated as long as the tolls can pay for them. 6. Tolls, tolls, tolls. Tolls are the SOV equivalent of fare box recovery! The primary users of the system should pay a higher cost.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

9a	1. The present set of lanes alternatives is fine. 2. Yes, as well as an ordinary HOV without separation. 3. (a) Yes. (b) Yes. 4. Yes! Absolutely essential. Need to add tolls to the TDM package and evaluate impact. Allied to this, consider the managed lane concept for a Bus-only/HCT lane, as in I-405 project. 5. (a) You have a good range now. (b) Yes – both long and short and graph the cost/sq ft. vs. total lid area and add it to your exhibit panels. 6. The pedestrian-bike trail: at I-405 interchange area. Be sure to maintain trail connection to 116th Ave. If possible, at 120th or 124th also build a trail bridge across the south leg of the SR 520/I-405 interchange (vicinity NE 20th St.).
10a	1. 8 lanes – even if new bridge is initially striped for 4. We need a new bridge – do not stint capacity – it will be needed 2. Yes. Not essential, but better to do it up front rather than try to change later. 3. In SR 520. I-90 works well as it is – leave it alone. Putting HCT on I-90 will be very costly and deliver very little (if any) additional capacity. The 520 Bridge must be rebuilt anyway. Do not put fixed guideway HCT anywhere unless studies really justify it. 4. Yes, legitimate subjects. Do not be too optimistic about impact of TDM. 5. Obviously shorter lids will be much cheaper. Depends on noise impact. We should look at both before deciding. 6. Alt. 8 seems by far the best solution. If total cost is too high initially, build a bridge with capacity for Alternative 8, but stripe it initially for 6 lanes to minimize associated costs on land. The bridge is the bottleneck. Since we have to rebuild the bridge, think long term. Keep LRT off I-90 – very expensive, and there is not a proven need. Sound Transit's record does not justify confidence in their estimates (either of cost or passengers). The eastside is so spread out that express buses will serve it better (much more flexible).
11a	1. Suggest 8 lanes for future capacity. Consider second bridge as back-up in emergency and repairs. 2. – 3. Bus Rapid Transit is preferred on SR 520 for flexibility. 4. Toll should be put back on bridge. 5. Shorter lids. 6. While fixing seismic needs on bridge, add more pontoons and widen bridge to take at least 2 more lanes of general purpose traffic. This will increase flow by 50% without cost of work at Montlake or Points communities. This should be Phase I of final recommended plan.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

12a	1. 8 lanes between I-5 and I-405; 6 lanes east of I-405 (existing). 2. Yes, the buffer is necessary, due to idiot SOV drivers probably trying to cheat and use the HOV lane. 3. Should be on SR 520, since a new bridge can facilitate the desired mode (LRT, monorail). I-90 express lanes are more suited as a transit way (2-way). BRT is a short-term solution, but an exclusive transit facility is needed. 4. Yes, if alternatives 6 or 8 are considered, then the added GP lane, with the new HOV/BRT lane, should be separated from the 2 existing GP lanes and priced according to time period congestion. 5. Preferably – non-ventilated lids for less operations and maintenance costs. Concept 2 is preferred for all locations. If ventilated lids are evaluated, annual costs of operations and maintenance need to be detailed in EIS. 6. If a GP lane is added, is it necessary to have it done for the entire corridor? Maybe only the area just between I-5/Montlake and I-405 needs the extra GP lane. Like reusing the exiting southbound I-5 to SR 520 tunnel off ramp for HOV access. Like moving the Mercer St. on ramp to enter from outer side, to reduce the infamous Mercer weave.
13a	1. 8 lanes (add 1 HOV and 1 GP each direction) – Alt. 4. 2. No. 3. I-90; yes. 4. Yes; yes. 5. Shorter. 6. Expedite – need is now!
14a	1. Assuming you mean SR 520; 6 lanes. 2. If; I see no objection. 3. (a) Forget the evaluations and make a move. If forced to choose, I'd say I-90. (b) No. 4. Of course pricing is important. The best way to evaluate is to put out a request for proposals to interested contractors. Allow room for them to present alternatives, if they have some. 5. Shorter lids. 6. I have separately volunteered to serve on an ad hoc committee(s) or in an advisory capacity.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

15a	1. Either 6 or 8 lanes. SR 520 has never been sized adequately to meet demand. Anything less than 6 lanes would be repeating the same mistake. How many bridges do you know of that are "too big," especially 10-20 years after construction? 2. Evaluate it, but I don't see the appeal. There has been no explanation of the pros/cons of this design aspect. 3. No. The recent Sound Transit funding overruns have destroyed confidence in HCT and Sound Transit, in particular. Putting HCT in this project anywhere would be buying another pig in a poke, and make it vulnerable. Do you want this project destroyed by the next Sound Transit scandal? 4. Pricing yes, TDM no. I've had some experience with TDM and found it takes constant effort by companies who don't really care. It's pushing water uphill. 5. Shorter is cheaper, therefore preferable. 6. Option #7 appears to be the best bang for the buck. A close second choice would be #8, an investment in extra capacity for the future. The bike/pedestrian access is THE MOST IMPORTANT part of the project! That portion looks pretty well thought out.
16a	I have no original thoughts regarding our transportation situation. However, after reading articles and listening to opinions, I have arrived at an opinion. I suggest, in order: 1. Replace the 520 bridge. a. 6 lanes; 4 is not enough, 8 is more than needed. b. It <u>might</u> be found desirable in terms of outage to: (1) Build the entire support structure, then (2) first finish and put into operation the inner 4, then the outer 2. 2. Provide for transportation between Kirkland and Seattle. If done quickly, this could relieve the pressures caused by the SR 520 outage. I suppose a vehicle/pedestrian ferry would be cheaper and sooner implemented than a bridge. Based on my background, I might be of some assistance in servicing on ad hoc committees and the like, or in some sort of an advisory position. In civil service I was a contracting officer based in Japan. I contracted for communications installations covering Japan and South Korea. Unlike the practice in the continental U.S. where one contracting officer wrote the contract and passed it to an administration contracting officer, I had responsibility from beginning to end, and discretion in the type of contract. If I were contracting for a bridge here I would consider: a. Writing a contract for work in a phased series, each phase separately priced. b. Activating each succeeding phase upon successful completion of the prior, (or considering changing contractors).

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

Open house at 4-8 p.m., January 17, 2002 located at the Museum of History and Industry, Seattle

#	Comments
1b	1. 6 lanes, 8 would overwhelm everything else. 2. Yes. In all cases, 12 or wider bike lane with greater separation from noise, exhaust and dust afforded by current I-90 path. A taller wall or elevated path would suffice. 3. Preserve future monorail/light rail option for 520. 4. Yes. Demand pricing would go further to reducing demand than anything else, maximizing return on investment 5. Short lids. Long lids prove to be traffic choke points and increase the cost of operation. 6. I am a hybrid vanpool/bicycle commuter across I-90. I take a van to work and ride the bike home 18 times/month on average. Combined bike and pedestrian paths are slow and dangerous during nice weather afternoons, so I take the road most of the time where possible. Bike paths should be separated from pedestrian paths wherever feasible, just as they are in parts of Southeast Sweden. (I saw nice examples in the Smaland region 20 years ago.) The only reason I ride the bike is for the exercise combined with commute. Otherwise, it doesn't make sense since it takes more time, money and is often unpleasant.
2b	1. 4 lanes only. 2. Yes, all above. 3. I-90, no. 4. No. 5. 100' wide Roanoke only. 6. Address the problem. Too many people. Limited infrastructure will limit the number of people in the area and maintain quality of life.
3b	1. 4 lanes only. 2. Yes – but I want you to stick to 4 lanes. 3. No. 4. No – waste of money. 5. Short lids – 100' wide Roanoke only. 6. Stop the idea of pouring more people from the eastside coming by and in our neighborhoods. Instead – use the money to make the express lanes a regular part of I-5. That would help I-5 handle the current level of traffic.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

4b	1. No more than 6 lanes. 2. Any additional lanes should be HOV. 3. Implementing HCT would be dependent on it producing lower noise impact to residential areas. 4. Of course pricing should be evaluated. Consider tolls for single passenger cars. 5. Evaluate both and consider Mercer Island style lids adjacent to residential areas. 6. Noise management is critical. Consider speed reductions, especially on streets adjacent to residences. Speed bumps on Eastlake Washington Boulevard would greatly reduce noise in that area.
5b	1. 4 lanes and 6 lanes. 8-lane option assures improvements onto I-5 that cannot work with additional traffic away from project area. 2. I do not understand the value of 4' buffer! 3. Rail transit N I-90 is the best alternative. 4. Yes. 5. Both. 6. Assumptions included in alternatives should be disclosed. These determine relative number of users and vehicles with each alternative. I believe alternative #3 is the best and is more effective than 4-8, but questions like I-5 traffic flow are not fully discussed especially through downtown! Example: Union, Stewart and Mercer St. Exits.
6b	1. The six-lane option seems to be the best alternate when considering both travel times and speed across the bridge, without impacting the neighborhoods too much. Alternative 3-6 lanes. 2. Sounds like a good idea, but the additional 10 feet on that option makes the corridor too wide. 3. – 4. – 5. Larger lids that would hide the roadway are the most neighborhood friendly. However the ventilation systems need to be quiet and non disruptive. Loud fans are not the answer. 6. The general purpose and HOV tunnel from SR 520 to Pacific is an excellent idea, as it will relieve traffic on Montlake Boulevard. Tunnel not HOV only, as congestion on Mont. will remain. While we wait for this new bridge to be built, making the onramps crossing the lake into 2 person HOV access only between 6-9am and 3:30-6:30 pm would help alleviate traffic on Montlake Boulevard.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

7b	1. – 2. – 3. – 4. – 5. The preference is for a lid system that benefits the community. That means however walkability can be improved would be advantageous. Thus, redirecting money from ventilation into amenities would be potentially preferable to the lids being longer. 6. –
8b	1. 6 lanes and HOV. 2. Yes. 3. I-90, don't know. 4. Yes, shift workdays (Tuesday – Saturday, Monday – Friday, ?Sunday – Thursday). Shift 8-hour times. 5. (Not important) 6. Air quality is important!
9b	1. – 2. – 3. – 4. – 5. – 6. Noise for neighboring homes might be diminished somewhat with additional speed controls – i.e., preventing cars from using residential streets as a pre-entry "rev-up" runway. They're on their way speeding up – before they even reach SR 520 ramps.
10b	1. 4 lanes only. 2. No, not enough space. 3. Put HCT in I-90 corridor consider only on SR 520 if just 4 lanes built. 4. Yes to both. 5. A lid at Montlake should be incorporated that allows for better circulation. 6. Look at a roundabout at Montlake to address congestion at streetlights. Talk with consultant to city of Seattle working on Rainier/MLK intersection.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

11b	1. 4 only: lowest cost, least impact on wetlands and neighborhoods. 6 if there are federal money – 2 new HOV/BRT Transit lanes. 2. Yes. 3. HCT best in I-90 corridor. 4. Yes and yes. 5. – 6. Alternative #2 is most affordable. Bike access over SR 520 is essential!! Alternative #7 is good if we're adding lanes – the BRT lanes will speed up bus transit, and can be modified for some form of rail transit if we can get the federal money.
12b	1. No SOV expansion, Transit only, Transit and HOV, Transit and HOV and Bike. 2. See above. 3. Both. 4. Yes. 5. The longer, the better. 6. Seattle can't take more cars, nor can I-5. Transit use is the solution. People use buses when cars get clogged and there's no parking.
13b	1. 4 lanes and 6 lanes only. Missing alternative: 4 lanes with 1 lane SOV and 1 lane HOV in each direction. 2. Yes. 3. HCT in I-90 only but leave possibility of HCT in SR520. 4. Yes, of course. I don't understand why TDM is considered a cost. Charging travelers for more of the actual cost of travel makes TDM a source of revenue. Eliminate free parking. Charge for use of the highways. Also include shift of costs to variable costs, e.g., insurance by the mile instead of by the year. 5. No opinion. 6. The EIS should determine the full and complete costs for each alternative, and especially publicize the level of subsidy required for each trip. Subsidies should include the full cost of providing "free" parking (it's no free – somebody is paying for it.) Also include safety costs, including costs of injury and recovery due to high crash rates from amateur and reckless drivers.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

14b	1. I think 4 and 6 lanes should be considered. I believe only HOV/Mass Transit/Bike capacity should be added. 2. Yes, but I don't know why one needs a 4' buffer. 3. Evaluation is fine, but before it is built it needs to be clearly an advantage over and above the bus lanes. 4. Price and likelihood of success of the project need to be considered. 5. I think longer lids should be considered. 6. I don't think we can improve cross lake travel significantly by building more general purpose lanes in the long term. Effort needs to be expended on "behavior changing alternatives" rather than just enabling current 1 passenger/car activity.
15b	1. 4 lanes, 6 lanes, one of the 8 lanes with HOV and HCT. 2. Yes. BRT has good opportunities for this corridor. 3. Yes – evaluate cost/impact of future HCT in SR 520 corridor. 4. Yes and yes. Make TDM pricing plan Regional or not at all. 5. Shorter lids only – connect communities by not very long lids. 6. –
16b	1. 4 lanes and 6 lanes. No more general purpose lanes! Not 8 lanes, (would become as congested as now and Seattle streets can't handle the additional traffic) So, evaluate alternatives 2, 3 and 7 only. 2. Yes. 3. I-90, yes. 4. Yes, Yes. 5. Shorter lids. 6. –
17b	1. 8 lanes – need an additional GP lane on SR 520. Let's plan for the future this time. 2. That would be optimal, but not a requirement. Again, I would support spending the necessary money and doing it right. 3. HCT on SR 520, put "light rail" on I-90. 4. Yes to both, but not at the expense of additional GP and HOV capacity. TDM should be an adjunct to GP and HOV, not a replacement. 5. Shorter lids. Ventilation is expensive and energy consuming. 6. I appreciate the work. Please count me as a person who supports and recognizes the value of HOV and Transit and TDM but also recognizes that the SOV is not evil and is not going away. We must add GP capacity. I also suggest that we spend the necessary money to develop the SR520 corridor correctly and allow for prudent future capacity expansions. Thank you, [Name].

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

18b	1. I prefer 8 lanes. 2. This seems like the most needed alternative. (Yes.) 3. Since the SR 520 corridor serves the U.W. and Redmond area technology centers, I prefer this route on a first build basis, and then I-90 HCT built later. 4. Yes to both. 5. We need to go with shorter lids wherever possible. 6. High capacity transit is greatly needed in the SR 520 corridor. Express buses in the HOV lanes would not be adequate to serve public needs.
19b	1. No more than 4 lanes. Plus consider rail only on SR 520 and I-90 option. 2. HOV lanes are not mass transit – only a cover for more freeway lanes. 3. Yes, yes. 4. Yes, if you cover all the private/public price/costs – see my handout at the Jan 17, 2002 meeting from the book on sustainability and cities (Overcoming Automobile Dependence by Peter Newman and Jeffrey Kenworthy). 5. We don't need billion dollar lids. We need heavy rail in tunnels like every other world class city has. We need to use and maintain what little RR right of way is left. See 405 RR 11. 6. Using the Dinner Train RR, which parallels I-405 and connects to rail on SR 520 and/or I-90 and to existing tunnels in Seattle would minimize the public and private costs of transportation over the foreseeable future. Buy BN row now before Grinstein raises the price.
20b	1. 6 lanes GP – one lane additional for HOV. 8 lanes impacts local traffic way too much. 6 lanes max GP, otherwise you must also increase neighborhood enhancements like local street intersections and other impacted areas. 2. No – I don't see the point – it would only add cost to lids, which are very necessary. 12' lanes are good enough for 8-foot vehicles. 3. Preserve corridor for now, forget SR 520 rail option. Where would it connect? 4. I don't understand. Yes, I guess. 5. Longer lids should be evaluated. We need noise protection and, more importantly, neighborhood connectivity for all points communities – especially Yarrow Point, also applies to Montlake. Correct the Gash of SR 520 from 1962!! 6. –

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

21b	1. Yes, yes, absolutely not. 2. – 3. – 4. – 5. – 6. –
22b	1. – 2. – 3. – 4. – 5. – 6. Make sure EIS includes option to reduce traffic volume through arboretum – not just maintaining status quo. Include bike connection to E. McGilvra from SR 520 bike lane.
23b	1. No additional lanes – keep footprint of existing freeway. 2. – 3. I-90. Yes. HCT on 520. 4. – 5. Longer lids. 6. Additional lanes can't be accommodated on I-5.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

24b	1. No action. 4 lanes with 2 HOV, 2 GP. 6 lanes. I am adamantly opposed to 8-lanes, but recognize that studying it might be good to have data to argue against it. 2. Is the 4' buffer required by design regulations or is it an "amenity"? If the latter, it shouldn't be included, as overall width is a big problem. (Already I see the buffers). 3. Any proposal that considers preserving HCT on SR 520 should guarantee that it would never be converted to SOV. 4. Yes, Yes, Yes – to both! See additional comments (if 3+ HOV lanes are allowed to cross bridge without going through toll plaza, additional pull-out spaces might be considered prior to getting on the bridge to accommodate the tendency for people in SOV's to pick up passengers for the crossing). Possibility of variable pricing depending on time of day??? 5. Both types of lids should be evaluated. 6. Bike/pedestrian lane is essential. Investigate modifications to Montlake bridge for changes in circulation, interchanges only – no changes to existing structure. HOV should be 3+ not 2+. Aggressive TDM should be undertaken. Variable pricing should definitely be studied, including no stop for toll for 3+ HOV. It is essential to coordinate with Sound Transit, especially now that schedules are virtually in sync, and Sound Transit is also considering Montlake Cut route. It is essential to insure that HOV lanes will remain HOV lanes. If alternative 04A, option H is studied for Montlake, there must be measures to prevent traffic from Lake Washington Boulevard Connecting to Pacific Street extension, thus increasing traffic through Arboretum, making Pacific St. extension only 2 lanes for HO, would achieve this. I have reservations (environmental, visual) about Pacific St. extension, but feel it has potential, merits further study. If Pacific St. extension is coordinated with Sound Transit Rail stop at Pacific, potential for flyer stop to move there.
25b	1. 8 2. Yes. 3. Both. 4. – 5. Longer lids with ventilation are best. 6. Close I-5 on-ramps on Harvard and Boylston. If you increase lanes on SR 520 and/or I-5 and do nothing, surface city streets in this area will be even more congested than they are now.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

26b	1. 4 lanes only. 2. No, not enough space. 3. Put HCT in I-90 corridor. Consider only on SR 520 if just 4 lanes built. 4. Yes to both. 5. There should definitely be a lid at Montlake. It should be big enough to include approved configuration of Lake Washington Boulevard. 6. Look at using a roundabout at Montlake overpass to address congestion that will be caused by signal lights. Suggest talking to Australian consultant who is working with the City of Seattle SPO office (talk with Barbara Gray, SPO) on designing a roundabout for the Rainier/MLK intersection.
27b	1. 4 lanes – no increase in capacity! The Eastlake neighborhood already absorbs too much pollution and noise! 2. No HOV lane unless it's exclusively for rapid transit. 3. Fixed guideway HCT is a great idea! 4. – 5. Whatever reduces noise and pollution. 6. The tunnel dumping onto Eastlake Ave. is a terrible idea. The neighborhood is very against this. You will see great resistance to this idea. Likewise the flyover in front of the grade school is also awful. It will expose the children to additional noise and pollution. HCT is the way to go.
28b	1. 4 or 6. 2. – 3. – 4. Yes. 5. Lids should be installed with the lids at or below current ground level. 6. Please send me information on the elevation of the routes along Lake Washington Boulevard east of Montlake Boulevard. The final plan needs to not raise the level above the current SR 520 level or not have any new above ground level walls.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

29b	1. At least one alternative should be 6 lanes – 2 GP each way and 1 LRT each way – connecting to the proposed N-5 line of Sound Transit – that HCT line is a red herring – we won't need that much capacity for 20 years. 2. Yes, but why a 4' buffer – use a Jersey barrier. 3. See above. 4. Pricing should be evaluated. Go back to tolls. 5. Do the ventilation. 6. We need to remove the intersection at the Arboretum. This is a major course of slow ups – and the new, long ramp will only improve it, not eliminate it.
30b	1. Not 8 – NEVER! 2. Study the downstream effect at Mercer and Montlake. 3. – 4. Charge every vehicle more, not just bridge vehicles. 5. No vents. 6. Expand, improve: the North/South traffic flow in Seattle. Seattle allows bizillion more parking garages in Northway Ship Canal and has not expanded N-S capacity since I-5 built in 1963.
31b	1. 6 lanes. 2. Yes. 3. I-90 corridor / yes. 4. Yes / yes. 5. Shorter lids. 6. How are you addressing? And how testing pollution: noise, particulates in air and water, and visual?

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

32b	1. 135' = 2/3 HOV/2 – no 190' – 8 lane – of any type. 2. 124' BRT is OK too – but no longer! 3. Trans-Lake needs to make a strong public statement now on the guarantee that I-90 will be converted to have 2 way buses in center lanes ASAP – (to protect the center lanes for future HCT) or they will never be available. 4. Vary the TDM for each option. More for the smaller less for the options that give more SOV capacity. Keep the corridor management agreement process moving. 5. Non-ventilated lids and for community connections, better designed noise walls. 6. This has been an excellent process. I am concerned that it not be streamlined and become mired in an untested process and end up with an "inadequate EIS."
33b	1. +An AH 2A should be created for evaluation in the EIS adding 1 GP lane on the bridge, Portage Bay viaduct and east to 108th Ave NE (1 lane each way). No HOV lane – improve alignment, meet new seismic standards replace old bridge. 2. No. No HOV/BRT lane should be added until one general purpose lane is added each way. Without at least 1 GP lane each way the project is dead. 3. HCT – neither SR 520 nor I-90. Both routes reduce the people carrying capacity of the bridges. 4. No, No. Pricing is a regional issue, and PSRC is dealing with the subject. 5. Shorter lids – no ventilation. 6. To limit or restrict trans-lake travel is to divide the socio-economic fabric of the region and hasten the development of twin cities. This is happening now. If trans-lake travel is accommodated, it will unite the socio-economic fabric of the region. Seattle's population is the same as 1965 even though 1.5 million people have moved into the region. If Seattle doesn't come to the table to promote trans-lake travel, it will be to Seattle's detriment. Montlake District is a traffic mess! Seattle people will move to the Eastside.
34b	1. 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane). 2. No. 3. No. 4. Yes. 5. All kinds, depending on location. Longer is better for neighborhoods. 6. Take roadway down (elevations) on Eastside to cut down on noise and sound wall/lid size.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

35b	1. 6 lanes (additional HOV lane). 2. No 4' buffer. 3. I-90 corridor. 4. ✓. 5. Longer lids. 6. –
36b	1. Please do include an evaluation of a 6-lane alternative (2 GP lanes + 2 HOV lanes in each direction). Alternative 3 is a good 6-lane scenario for the EIS. 2. Yes, it is necessary to separate the GP and the HOV lanes, for reasons of safety and operational efficiency. 3. I-90 is the better corridor for HCT. Yes, the EIS should evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor, as it will be needed at some point in the future. 4. Yes, include TDM. Tolls okay. The people who use the facility should help pay for it. 5. In order to satisfy neighborhoods, it is necessary to fully evaluate mitigation options. Seattle neighborhoods got burned in the first SR 520 project and will expect and insist on adequate consideration in this new project. 6. Please ensure that alternative 3 (or something very similar) is evaluated in the EIS. It is important to include an alternative that does not substantially increase general purpose capacity while improving mobility for transit, HOV and pedestrian/bike. For any alternative that increases general purpose vehicle capacity, please ensure that the EIS considers the effect of these additional vehicles on city streets.
37b	1. 6 lanes (HOV, express bus). 2. – 3. No HCT on 520 in the meantime, but preserve the possibility on SR 520 of adding future HCT rights-of-way in the future. 4. TDM must be studied. Tolls are OK. User fee is appropriate. 5. Evaluate lids with maximum coverage. 6. There must be funding in that projects for mitigation of additional traffic on such adjacent Seattle Streets as Fairview, Mercer, Eastlake, and Valley. New pedestrian facilities will be needed at such intersections as Fairview/Mercer, Fairview/Valley, Fairview/Denny.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

38b	1. No on eight lanes – also study no action + rail only – 6 lanes (additional HOV lane). 2. No. Extra cost unjustified, given land hungry needs already. 3. No. I-90 only – SR 520 corridor preservation. 4. ?HUH?? 5. Longer lids for recapture of SR 520 Gash. Reconnect our neighborhoods!! Cut our noise!! We don't want huge vertical walls cutting views + fencing us in!! 6. –
39b	1. 1 HOV each direction, rail lines, ped/bike lane. Limit expansion and provide alternative modes of transportation. Don't keep building general lanes, force people to use HOV/rail/bike. 2. No, eliminate width when possible. 3. Yes, evaluate. Yes to both. 4. Yes, both I-90 and SR 520 improvements should be based on a coordinated approach that moves people/commerce but tries to move them out of cars and into public transportation facilities. 5. Lids should mitigate impacts to residential neighborhoods. I-90 lid is wonderful and very expensive. Lids need to provide safe crossings for pedestrian/bikes over SR 520 and work with bike trails. 6. Environmental concerns are great. Assuming ESA will allow a tunnel to UW and cross Montlake is preferred. A flyover bridge is a permanent visual impact and will block views of natural areas across the canal. Mainline I-5/520 4F with tunnels down to Fairview have too many impacts and further support the wide multi-model alternatives 5 and 6 are impractical and unnecessary. New bridge over Portage Bay at SYC is too much bridge over the bay. Keep alignment nearer to where it is.
40b	1. No eight lanes. 2. Do not have extra four feet. 3. – 4. – 5. – 6. No tunnel thru Eastlake! More study on reflected noise from Flyover – didn't do sound mitigation promised with I-5 and Ship Canal Bridge, so why would we trust you now to do it or do it right?

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

41b	1. 6 lanes 2. Yes 3. Fixed guideway = rail? If "fixed guideway" means rail, as per Sound Transit, I would argue that it not be evaluated on either SR 520 or I-90. The financial feasibility – regardless of technical feasibility – of cross lake rail is even more problematic than ST's Phase 1 between the airport and the U. District or Northgate. 4. TDM is relevant only to the extent it can (will, really) reduce the bridge width by a lane in each direction. Pricing probably should await regional policy decisions but it certainly should be made clear to the public that tolling is a possibility, if not a probability. 5. – 6. 1) I like the less-costly solution to interfacing SR 520 with I-5; I hope this approach can be part of a 6-lane bridge option. 2) The additional cost ($300 million?) of a tunnel under the Ship Canal is not warranted to avoid the visual, noise and (wildlife) environmental impacts. Can't that $300 million be spent on more effective mitigation measure? At this and/or other impacted locations?
42b	1. 2 – both bicycle. OK for real 4 GP lanes, 2 monorail, 1 bike, occasional shoulders 2. Monorail or light rail only. No bus HOV 3. What the heck is that? If you aren't doing trains, don't do it. 4. Oh come on – Humans don't care about such big wordedness. 5. You are trying to manipulate me into a technical opinion without facts – location, decibel reduction. Do I want lids? Yes and no. I want Roanoke overpass to be human compatible. Montlake can speak for itself. 6. I fell meetinged-out. Soon, only the zealots and parasites will remain in this process. I want – and this has changed minimally over the last 15 years: (1) Legitimate noise barriers for Boylston and Harvard from the middle of the Ship Canal to the middle of the colonnades. (2) The express lanes re-designed for noise reduction. (3) #1 and #2 occurring before SR-520 expansion construction (4) Non-vehicular traffic over SR-520 (5) The Roanoke overpass expanded to allow comfortable crossings by pedestrians and bikes. (6) No freeway expansion outside of existing roadway – including no tunnel under Boylston. (7) Respect. We are the ones who are bike and foot commuters – the truest answer to freeway congestion. We do what our governments encourage. In return, we get noise, particulate pollution, endless meetings suggesting vast expansion of the same and only empty promises for noise mitigation at the end of the project – not now. We want it now. We want respect for urban life styles now. We want some WSDOT credibility. And none has been shown.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

43b	1. 6 lanes are way enough – traffic tends to spread wide instead moving ahead. 2. If a HCT system is not doable, yes, I would recommend a HOV/Bus only lane 3. Definitely I believe there should be more consideration on HCT and Bike/Pedestrian that on car/bus lane 4. – 5. – 6. Concern of welfare of Boylston St. especially North of Roanoke right of way, lake, noise, accessibility.
44b	1. My choice Alternate 3. No more SOV lanes – new lanes should be dedicated to mass transit capacity force those whiners out of their cars. Bicycle and Pedestrian capacity should be included. 2. Whatever is safer should be evaluated. I can see that a buffer might seem to be safer but high risk drivers might use it in risky manner. 3. I-90 corridor should have HCT. If funds permit evaluation for SR 520 yes do the evaluation now. Nothing gets cheaper. 4. I think its good to periodically evaluate all aspects of programs but to do it routinely in all EIS seems excessive. But I don't want shoddy work done. I think some attention needs to be made to at least acknowledge the positive aspects of TDM and I think we do need to pay attention to price. My interest is adding mass transit only. 5. This project should pay attention to the neighborhoods impacted. I live on 25th NE. I'm concerned about how this will affect my street because it is a principal arterial. Most of us can't afford to move and relocate in a less impacted area. Yes – evaluate longer lids if it mitigates impacts on neighborhoods. 6. Mass transit, mass transit, mass transit. I'm tired of listening to SOVers whining about the traffic as if they themselves are the only people in the world deserving to use their cars in an indiscriminate manner. If you're alone in a car you are part of the problem period. There is no such status as being more equal than another.
45b	1. 6 lanes 2. I don't care 3. I-90 4. Transportation 5. As long as short lids mean that neighborhoods will be reconnected. 6. –

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

46b	1. – 2. – 3. – 4. – 5. – 6. (1) Evaluate add and drop lanes at Montlake Blvd. (2) Evaluate partial "lids" at edges of Montlake retaining walls ("horizontal sound walls") (3) Evaluate center lines sound wall through Montlake.
47b	1. 6 lanes, with the 2 new ones being HOV. 2. Yes 3. HCT should be in I-90 corridor – evaluate preservation of HCT on SR 520 for the future. 4. Yes on TDM. Pricing is tricky because of ability to pay issues. 5. Don't know 6. Emphasize and encourage alternatives to SOV: vanpools, buses, bikeways, walkways, etc.
48b	1. – 2. – 3. – 4. – 5. – 6. It is very very difficult to make sense of so many options when presented in this format. Way too much complex information offered – this is not a fair evaluation if the public is not informed via this method in my opinion and that of others I have spoken with tonight. This would be fine after a slide presentation with explanations and reasons for the design options. It seems like we are being railroaded into taking more traffic instead of encouraging HOV and rapid transit.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

49b

Sustainability and Cities by Peter Newman and Jeffery Kenworthy (p. 377)
Island Press, 1718 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 300, Washington D.C. 20009

Private Sector costs, TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICE COSTS

Transportation Costs

Annual transportation costs
Each new development proposal should be accompanied by a statement that clearly sets out the ongoing transportation costs for residents and for accessing nonresidential uses from outside the development. These should be calculated initially on an annual basis and include the following:

Annual Costs of Transportation Items

Cost Item	Cost of Travel by Residents ($)	Cost of Access from Outside ($)
(1) Capital cost of cars	(blank lines)	(blank lines)
(2) Fuel costs		
(3) Miscellaneous operating cost of cars		
(4) Time costs		
(a) Private transportation		
(b) Transit		
(c) Walking and cycling		
(5) Road costs		
(6) Parking costs		
(7) Externalities		
(a) Fatalities		
(b) Injuries		
(c) Property damage		
(d) Air pollution		
(e) Noise Pollution		

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

-C-49b

(f) Other quantifiable external costs
(8) Transit costs (capital and operating)

TOTAL ANNUAL TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Capitalizing annual transportation costs
Once the annual cost of each transportation item has been calculated, it is possible to capitalize these costs to present values using an appropriate discount rate and a period of fifteen years (the approximate life of an average car). Transportation costs can then be included with servicing costs on the same basis.

Capitalized Annual Transportation Costs

	Cost of Travel by Residents ($)	Cost of Access from Outside ($)
Private Transport		
Transit	(blank lines)	(blank lines)
TOTAL CAPITALIZED TRANSPORTATION COSTS		

Overall Economic Costs of the Development

	Public sector ($)	Private sector ($)
Infrastructure and servicing costs	(blank lines)	(blank lines)
Transportation costs		
TOTAL ECONOMIC COSTS		

Inner City Development (Fremantle)
Transportation Costs
Annual Transportation costs
Each new development should be accompanied by a statement that clearly presents the ongoing transportation costs. These should be calculated initially on an annual basis and include the following:

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

-C-49b

Annual Costs of Transportation Items

Cost Item	Cost of Travel by Fringe Residents ($)	Cost of Travel by Inner City Residents ($)
(1) Capital cost of cars	5,447,000	1,888,000
(2) Fuel costs	2,055,000	760,000
(3) Other operating costs of cars	2,689,000	932,000
(4) Time costs		
(a) private transportation	5,183,000	1,967,545
(b) transit	na	1,920,028
(c) walking and cycling	na	na
(5) Road costs	2,215,000	768,000
(6) Parking costs	4,867,000	1,379,000
(7) Externalities (Total)	443,940	153,860
(a) Fatalities	133,635	46,315
(b) Injuries	43,035	14,915
(c) Property damage	70,215	24,335
(d) Air pollution	165,345	57,305
(e) Noise pollution	31,710	10,990
(f) Other quantifiable external costs		
(8) Transit costs (capital and operating)	297,000	1,980,000
TOTAL ANNUAL TRANSPORTATION COSTS	23,196,940	11,748,433

Capitalizing annual transportation costs Once the annual cost of each transportation item has been calculated, it is then possible to capitalize these costs to present values using an appropriate discount rate and a period of fifteen years (which is approximately the life of an average car) Transportation costs can then be included with servicing costs on the same basis.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

50b	1. -- 2. -- 3. -- 4. -- 5. -- 6. Sensible Solutions for Trans-Lake Mobility. The Washington State Department of Transportation and Sound Transit are now accepting public comment on the scope of impacts and transportation and policy alternatives to be evaluated in the Trans-Lake Washington Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). To identify the most cost-effective, balanced, and environmentally sound combination of highway, transit and transportation demand management (TDM) investments to improve Trans-Lake mobility, the Project EIS must include analysis of: 1. The "Expanded Trip Reduction Program." Potentially the most cost-effective investment, this program includes entrepreneurial grants as an incentive for employers to develop innovative trip-reduction strategies (Examples include van-pools, parking cash-out, expanded FlexPass, telecommuting, and 'smart-growth'). 2. Variable road pricing as a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy and potential source of revenue for the Trans-Lake improvements 3. Alternatives with no more than six-lanes on SR 520 including new HOV or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) facilities (Preliminary Alternatives 2, 3, 5, 7) 4. Alternatives that include a new Trans-Lake bike/pedestrian facility in the SR 520 Corridor. The transportation Choices Coalition is a state-wide non-profit organization dedicated to expanding Washingtonians' transportation choices through education and advocacy. For more information on TCC membership and our "Expanding Choices" campaign in King County, contact Kevin Shively, Regional Policy and Field Coordinator at: Kevin@transportationchoices.org; (206) 329-2336

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

51b	Canterbury Shores Condominium Association, January 14, 2002 Trans-Lake Washington Project, WA. State Dept. of Transportation, 401 Second Ave. S., Suite 300, Seattle, WA 98104 Re: SR 520 EIS Alternatives Dear Sirs: The Canterbury Shore Condominium SR 520 Owners Committee would like to express its opinion and concern about the "current alternatives" that you plan on including in your EIS. The alternatives that you include in your notice for the January 15 and 17th meetings only includes matters concerning the life and capacity of the existing or a possible future bridge. The alternatives do not, at least explicitly, deal with issues such as alternative locations for the bridge, alternative access to and from the bridge, nor various environmental issues. The following paragraphs will elaborate. The EIS does not deal with access issues. Concentrating on only the west Lake Washington side, where and how will SR 520 connect with I-5? What are the congestion implications? What are the alternatives? Where and how will SR520 connect with Montlake/23rd Ave? What are traffic, congestions and environmental implications? What are the alternatives? This includes specifics for both the Montlake Community and the University of Wash. To evaluate there must be alternatives. Your proposed EIS scope has a significant locational bias in it. The bias is both directional (i.e. north/south) and elevational (vertical). From a directional standpoint, where are the possible locations? How will these relate to existing land uses (i.e. Seattle Yacht Club, University of Wash. Facilities, the Arboretum. How will different locations affect fish habitat, birds, etc? To study the alternative impacts you need alternative locations. From a vertical perspective, the bridge can be elevated, at surface level, or below the surface at different locations. The "do nothing" option is pretty clear; the bridge stays where it is, as it is, and is both at surface level and elevated. One of the most significant biases in your proposed analysis is you are not proposing to study a below surface (tunnel, as is being evaluated for SR99/Alaskan Way in downtown Seattle) alternative. The "do nothing" alternative looks at one extreme of the options. You do not propose to analyze the other extreme alternative, putting SR 520 in a tunnel. This will be particularly important for the environmental analysis, as the following paragraphs show.

1. *How many lanes should be evaluated in the EIS – 4 lanes, 6 lanes (additional HOV lane), and/or 8 lanes (additional HOV and general purpose lanes)?*
2. *If an HOV lane is evaluated in the EIS, should it be evaluated as a combined Bus Rapid Transit/HOV lane with a 4' buffer between it and the general purpose lane?*
3. *Should a fixed guideway high capacity transit (HCT) system be evaluated in the SR 520 or in the I-90 corridor? If it should be evaluated in the I-90 corridor, should the EIS evaluate preservation of HCT in the SR 520 corridor for the future?*
4. *Should transportation demand management be evaluated in the EIS? Should pricing be evaluated in the EIS?*
5. *What type of highway lids should be evaluated in the EIS? Should longer lids that require ventilation be evaluated or should shorter lids (less than 500') that do not require ventilation?*
6. *Additional Comments*

-C-51b	When SR 520 discussions began WSDOT representatives (an printed matter) indicated there would be no "negative environmental impacts" from a new bridge. From our perspective, possible negative environmental impacts, or externalities, may be associated with noise, air quality, particulate matter, water quality, and visual affects. These, as well as others, will need to be studied as a part of the EIS process. However, if you do not include both extremes regarding vertical placement of the bridge, it will not be possible to study some of the affects. For example, with a tunnel there would be no noise, air quality, particulate matter, water quality or visual affects. They all could be internalized. The results of the EIS process you propose will be to account for maximum environmental affects, but to not account for the minimums. Consequently, the process that you propose has a significant flaw in it. Some would call it a fatal flaw. Canterbury Shores represents 92 property owners who will be significantly impacted by what may eventually be done with the SR 520 bridge. Therefore, we urge you to seriously consider and evaluate all alternatives dealing with your cited capacity issues. Sincerely, [signature]